UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,232	05/23/2000	Lundy Lewis	019287-0317258	3633
909 7590 10/30/2009 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500			EXAMINER	
			ENGLAND, DAVID E	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2443	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/577,232	LEWIS, LUNDY		
=	Examiner	Art Unit		
	DAVID E. ENGLAND	2443		
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>RC</u>	cation: <u>RCE</u>		
(1) <u>DAVID E. ENGLAND</u> .	(3)			
(2) Syed Jafar Ali Reg. No. 58780.	(4)			
Date of Interview: 26 October 2009	Time: <u>10:30 am</u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)			
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: none				
Claims discussed: 46 and 55				
Prior art documents discussed:				
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
/David E. England/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443 (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted the Attorney of record to discuss the claims and possible amendments to the claims to have them allowed. Examiner stated that the claims would be allowable if they applied a amendment similar in nature that is found in copending application 09/577231, i.e., in the specification it states that the invention looks at both domain information and then narrows down to one domain and then one or more component parameters that caused the problem. Claim 55 is the only claim that is close to the limitations found in the co-pending application but it does not state the multiple domain monitoring/ measuring and the determination between them to find the cause of the problem. The Attorney of record stated that they would purpose claim amendments that would reflect the same limitations that would be used in the co-pending application 09/577231 to all of the independent claims using claim 55 as a reference. Examiner awaits the Attorney's claim draft to finalize the amendment.

Furthermore, a terminal disclaimer would have to be filed so Double patenting rejections can be avoided with applications 09/577224, 09577231 and patent 7600007.